DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 123 300 UD 016 012

AUTHOR Dietrich, Katheryn Thomas
TITLE Rurality/Urbanism and Extended Familism Among Working- and Lower-Class Blacks.
PUB DATE Aug 75
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Rural Sociological Society (San Francisco, California, August 1975)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Comparative Analysis; Cultural Differences; Ecological Factors; Economic Disadvantagement; *Environmental Influences; *Family Characteristics; Family Structure; Lower Class; Low Income Groups; Minority Groups; *Negroes; Rural Environment; Rural Family; Rural Population; *Rural Urban Differences; Social Differences; Socioeconomic Status; Urban Environment; Urban Population

ABSTRACT

A comprehensive look is taken at the rural-urban variation in extended familism among a segment of the population for which extended familism purportedly is especially salient: lower and working class black Americans. The study is guided by the general hypothesis that rurality/urbanism affects extended familism when nonecological variables are held constant. Differences by two dimensions of rurality/urbanism are analyzed--current place of residence and rural-urban experience. Three general dimensions of extended familism are examined: patterns of coresidence, amount of interaction among kin not living in the same households, and relative functionality of interaction with kin to nonkin. Because extant evidence and theoretical bases for predictions of relationships between rurality/urbanism and extended familism appear contradictory, no attempt is made to hypothesize and test the direction of rural-urban differences. The hypothesis that no rural-urban differences exist is supported with some caution since the statistic used for significance is sensitive to sample size, and because the sampling procedures for this study are not random. Another finding is that both the non-ecological and ecological variable effects are insufficient to explain as much as one-half or more of the variation in extended familism among the blacks. This indicates that all of the important ecological and/or nonecological factors affecting extended familism are not tapped by this study. (Author/AM)

**********
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
**********

ED123300

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

# RURALITY/URBANISM AND EXTENDED FAMILISM AMONG WORKING- AND LOWER-CLASS BLACKS

by
Katheryn Thomas Dietrich
Texas Agricultural Experiment Station
Texas A&M University

*Paper to be presented at the annual meetings of the Rural Sociological Society, San Francisco, August, 1975. This paper contributes to TAES project H-2906 and USDA (CSRS) regional project NC-128, "Quality of Life as Influenced by Area of Residence".

UD 016 012

# RURALITY/URBANISM AND EXTENDED FAMILISM AMONG WORKING- AND LOWER-CLASS BLACKS

## INTRODUCTION

For decades, sociological interest in extended familism[1/] was dominated by debate about the isolation of the nuclear family in urban industrial societies. Unfortunate consequences of this dominating interest was restriction of research on extended familism to metropolitan centers and unwarranted inferences about rural-urban[2/] differences from these metropolitan, instead of comparative, studies (Winch and Blumberg, 1968; Straus, 1969). Recent comparative research attempts to correct this situation are few and restricted in scope. They have focused primarily on the amount of kinship interaction among the white middle-and working-classes. This narrow emphasis neglects the variety of forms which extended familism may take, for example, co-residence as well as interaction between residences. This emphasis also neglects the functionality of kin interaction,[3/] the relative salience of extended-family interaction to nonfamilial interaction, and specification of the relationship of rurality/urbanism and extended familism among our many racial, ethnic, and social class groups. This study attempts a more comprehensive look at rural-urban variation in extended familism among a segment of our population for which extended familism purportedly is especially salient: lower-and working-class black Americans.

Extended familism has been depicted as so salient an aspect of life among lower-class blacks (Stack, 1974; Billingsley, 1968; Bernard, 1966; Frazier, 1939; Drake and Cayton, 1962) that it is said to be simultaneously one of the greatest sources of strength and weakness of the lower-class,

black family (Stack, 1974; Cohen and Hodges, 1963). The strength of extended familism among lower-class blacks is its importance as an adaptive mechanism which enables these disadvantaged Americans to cope with economic deprivation. This extended familism takes the form of reciprocal exchanges of food, clothing, shelter and instrumental services (Stack, 1974), as well as psychic services (Cohen & Hodges, 1963). Such reciprocity takes the form of co residence (Billingsley, 1968; Bernard, 1966; Stack, 1974) and exchange among multiple households (Stack, 1974). Patterns of co-residence frequently mentioned in the literature are three-generational households (Bernard, 1966; Frazier, 1939; Drake & Cayton, 1962; Billingsley, 1968) and "child-keeping" (Stack, 1974), as of a grandchild or sibling's child.

In addition, lower-class, black extended familism is reportedly characterized by nearly exclusive restriction of social-interaction systems to kin or "fictive" kin (Cohen & Hodges, 1963) and the primacy of kin over marital relationships (Stack, 1974; Keil, 1966; Cohen & Hodges, 1963). Herein lie the dysfunctions of lower-class, black extended familism. Exclusive dependence on kin precludes access to other potential sources of help and may contribute to a narrow experience world (Cohen & Hodges, 1963). The primacy granted kin relationships drains economic resources from nuclear families and may contribute to instability of nuclear families (Stack, 1974). Stack and Lombardi (Stack, 1974) claim that the latter two dysfunctions, in turn, reduce possiblities for social mobility.

Much of the extant data on extended familism among blacks have been collected in metropolitan ghettoes, are products of small-scale anthropological studies, and describe only the lower-class. Sociologists do not know how pervasive these forms of extended familism are among blacks nor what factors may effect their variation. To the extent to which extended familism is

functional and dysfunctional, as suggested above, variation along the rural-urban continuum in salience and forms of extended familism would have significant implications with respect to sources of variation in the abilities of black families to cope with economic deprivation, to maintain family stability, and to be socially mobile.

Although evidence exists of high kin interaction among metropolites (Adams, 1968; Bell & Boat, 1962; Litwak, 1960; Feagin, 1968; Stack, 1974), comparative studies reveal differences along two dimensions of the rural-urban continuum: place of residence (Straus, 1969; Winch & Greer, 1968; Kahl, 1968; Mercer, 1967; Bultena, 1969; Key, 1961; Sweetser, 1966) and rural-urban background (Berardo, 1966). In general, the findings of these studies support propositions that rural residence is positively associated with amount of kin interaction (Straus, 1969; Winch and Greer, 1968), instrumental functionality of kin interaction (Winch and Greer, 1968) and co-residence among kin (Mercer, 1967). Likewise, rural background has been found to be positively associated with amount of kin interaction (Berardo, 1966). Results of two studies, however, suggest that the relationship between rurality and extended familism is not always positive nor is it necessarily linear. Bultena (1969) found kin interaction of elderly samples to be greatest in metropolitan areas. Key (1961) found a curvilinear relationship between amount of kin interaction and place of residence, with the order from highest to lowest being: rural, metropolitan, small town, village.

Although only one of the foregoing rural-urban comparisons was of American blacks, Mercer's study of co-residence, the expost facto explanations offered for the observed differences seem about as germane to lower-class blacks as to the particular populations studied. Thus, such explanations offer at

least a theoretical start for predicting rural-urban differences among lower-class blacks. Winch and Greer (1968) attribute evidence of greater extended familism of rural samples to the greater stability of rural populations and to greater familistic values associated with rural gemeinschaft- type culture. Bultena (1969) argues the opposite to explain his contradictory findings: familistic values may not be any more pervasive in rural than metropolitan communities, and rural-to-urban migration has resulted in greater numbers of kin in metropolitan than rural areas. Key (1961), on the other hand, explains similarities between kin interaction of rural and metropolitan residents by their similar isolation from primary contacts other than kin. He proposes rural residents are spatially isolated and urban residents are socially isolated from nonfamilial primary contacts; hence, their primary-contact alternatives to kin interaction are less than among small town and village residents.

Put in broader theoretical context, the theories of rural-urban differences in extended-familism can be divided into those which support an ecological explanation of rural-urban differences and those which support a nonecological explanation.[4/] The latter is that no rural-urban differences exist which cannot be accounted for by nonecological factors such as socio-economic status, stage of family life cycle, etc.

This study is guided by the general hypothesis that rurality/urbanism affects extended familism when nonecological variables are held constant. Differences by two dimensions of rurality/urbanism are analyzed: (1) current place of residence and (2) rural-urban experience. Three general dimensions of extended familism are examined: (1) patterns of co-residence, (2) amount of interaction among kin not living in the same households, and (3) relative functionality of interaction with kin to nonkin. The following nonecological

variables, which have also been observed to be associated with extended-familism, are controlled in the analysis: (1) social class (Stack, 1974; Feagin, 1968; Cohen and Hodges, 1963; Gans, 1962), (2) husband's presence or absence (Billingsley, 1968); (3) migratory status (Palisi, 1966; Winch and Greer, 1968; Aldous, 1967; Blumberg, and Bell, 1959), and (4) stage of family life cycle (Reiss, 1962; Aldous, 1967, Sussman and Burchinal, 1962), as reflected by age of homemaker.

Because extant evidence and theoretical bases for predictions of relationships between rurality/urbanism and extended familism appear contradictory, no attempt is made in this paper to hypothesize and test the direction of rural-urban differences. Instead, this study utilized Goodman's methods of contingency table analysis which permit testing of the significance of the effects of the rurality/urbanism variables when the effects of nonecological variables are controlled. At the same time, Goodman's methods are used to explore and compare the magnitude and direction of independent variable effects and test for curvilinear as well as linear effects.

## THE SAMPLES

This study is restricted to analysis of extended familism in and among households involved in child-rearing. The data were collected from 455 black female adults who identified themselves as the women mainly responsible for caring for homes in which a child under 18 years of age resided. The respondents were also required to be under 65 years of age and over 18, unless they were the mothers of children in their households.

Rural non-farm and small urban samples of black females meeting the foregoing requirements were taken in 1970 in a nonmetropolitan county of East Texas. Among the reasons the county was selected as a survey site were that the county was not contiguous to a metropolitan county, it was not highly urbanized, it had a high percentage black population compared to the state of Texas generally, and it was located in an area of the state known to be culturally similar to the "Deep South." Metropolitan samples of eligible black females were collected in 1971 in a black ghetto of Houston's inner-city. The census tract where the sample was taken was 99 percent black, had a much lower median income than the city of Houston generally, and was part of the metropolitan core. These particular nonmetropolitan and metropolitan study areas were also chosen because they exhibited the following differences which distinguish the black populations of nonmetropolitan counties (not adjacent to metropolitan areas) and metropolitan core areas in the U.S. generally: the nonmetropolitan black population had a higher dependency ratio, a higher sex ratio, a higher fertility ratio, fewer female-headed families, lower median educational attainment, lower median family income, and a higher incidence of low-income persons.[5/] Likewise, the rural black population of the nonmetropolitan county was distinguished from the urban black population of the nonmetropolitan county by a higher dependency ratio, a higher sex ratio, a higher fertility ratio, fewer female-headed families, lower median years of schooling, lower median family income, and a higher incidence of families in poverty.

The rural sample consisted of 52 black females, representing about 98 percent of all the eligible black females who resided in two open-country "communities."[6/] None resided on a farm. The small-urban sample consisted of 207 black females, representing 94 percent of all of the eligible black females who resided in the only urban center of the county. This town had

a population of about 5,000. The metropolitan sample of black females was derived from a fifty-percent random sample of households in the black ghetto area. Two hundred ninety-four black females, representing about 97 percent of the eligible females, were interviewed.

All respondents of families in which the main earner was employed in white-collar or skilled occupations according to Hollingshead's occupational index (Bonjean, 1967) were excluded from the samples for this analysis. This reduced the number of respondents for this analysis to 48 rural, 180 small urban, and 228 metropolitan black females.

## MEASUREMENT

### Measures of Extended Familism

Three patterns of *co-residence* were measured:

1. *Extended-Family Households*, which was operationalized as households in which kin outside of the homemaker's conjugal nuclear family lived for a month or more during the year preceding the survey;

2. *Extended-Family Households with More Than Two Generations*, which refers to the total number of generations living in the extended-family households during the year preceding the survey;

3. *Extended-Family Households involved in Child-Keeping*, which was operationalized as extended-family households in which kin under 18 years of age (other than the homemakers own, step, or foster children) lived during the year preceding the survey.

Each of these variables was coded "Yes" or "No" in the analysis.

Amount of *interaction with kin living outside of the homemakers' households* was measured by two variables, one reflecting absolute amount; the other, amount relative to other primary-group or-individual interaction.

1. *Absolute amount of interaction with kin*, was tapped by the question, "Roughly how many times a month do you see and visit with relatives?" Responses to this question were analyzed only for those homemakers who reported relatives living within "visiting distance" (i.e., meaning "you would go and return the same day.") Responses of 4

or more were coded "high" and responses of less than 4 were coded "low" in the analysis.

2. *Predominance of kin interaction over other types of primary-group or-individual interaction* was determined by comparing raw responses to the above question to the homemakers' responses to identical questions asked with reference to "neighbors," "friends from work," and "other friends." If a homemaker visited kin more often than neighbors and friends, the variable was coded "Yes"; if not, the variable was coded "No".

Another indicator of *interaction with kin* was *amount of nonmonetary aid received from kin.*

This variable was measured by the following question:

1. "How often do you receive food, clothes, or anything else other than money from relatives?" For this analysis, responses were dichotomized "never" and "sometimes or often"

The following four survey items measured *relative functionality of kin to nonkin interaction:*

1. "I get help from relatives more than from people not related to me."

2. "I give help to relatives more than to people not related to me."

3. "I talk about problems more with relatives than with people not related to me."

4. "I spend more time with relatives than with people not related to me."

The responses were coded "yes" or "no".

Measures of Rurality/Urbanism

*Current residence* corresponds to the sample areas of rural non-farm, small town, or metropolitan. *Rural/Urban experience* was determined by asking the homemaker:

"How much of your life have you lived in rural areas, that is, in the country or in a town of under 2,500 people?"

Responses were dichotomized as "over-half" or "under half" for this analysis.

Nonecological Variables

*Husband presence/absence* refers to whether or not a homemaker's husband was living in her home for a period of a month or more during the year preceding the survey.

*Social class* was determined from the job of the family's main earner during the year. If the family's main earner was employed as a semi-skilled or kindred worker as defined by Hollingshead's occupational index (Bonjean, 1967) the family was coded "working-class." If the main earner was unskilled or the family had no income earner during the year, the family was coded "lower-class."

*Migratory status* was determined from the birthplace of the homemaker. Those born over 50 miles from their current place of residence were considered "migrants"; all others, "nonmigrants."

The *homemaker's age* was used as an indicator of stage of family life-cycle. The ages were coded "over 45," "between 30 & 45," "under 30."

## ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

The advantage of using Goodman's methods of contingency table analysis for this particular analysis is that the methods give estimates of main and interaction effects (which are somewhat analogous to direct and indirect path coefficients), permit estimation of the statistical significance of these effects, and permit estimation of tests of association analogous to coefficients of partial and multiple determination. Unlike convential regression analysis, however, Goodman's methods do not require the assumptions of interval-level measurement, normality, homoscedasticity, additivity, or independence

of error terms (Goodman, 1972; Davis, 1974; Kasarda and Janowitz, 1974).

The first procedure of analysis was construction of seven-way contingency tables, each incorporating the rurality/urbanism variables, the four non-ecological variables, and one extended-familism variable. Second, effect parameters (Goodman's Betas) of the saturated models for each contingency table were computed to determine what, if any, interaction effects were statistically significant.[7/] None of the interaction effects were found to be statistically significant at the .05 probability level.[8/] This finding indicates that the indirect effects of the rurality/urbanism variables on extended-familism via the nonecological variables were small. Therefore, if rurality/urbanism did significantly affect extended familism among the black samples, the effect must have been direct, i.e., not due to the non-ecological factors.

The next step was to recompute the main effect parameters from unsaturated models which deleted interaction effects (Tables 1 - 3). The coding of the variables was ordered in the analysis so that a positive linear effect parameter would indicate that rural residence, rural experience, husband absence, lower social-class, nonmigrant status, or older homemaker's age was associated with high extended familism. A positive quadratic effect would indicate that the middle category of the polytomous variables was the category most highly associated with extended familism. Standardized Goodman's Betas were computed[9/] to permit comparisons of the effects of the rurality/urbanism variables and the nonecological variables on the extended familism variables. Unstandardized Goodman's Betas permitted comparisons of the effects of each independent variable across the different extended-familism variables.

The main effects of the rurality/urbanism variables on the coresidence variables are presented in Table 1. The effects of both current residence and rural/urban experience on all three co-residence variables were small and not statistically significant. Comparing standardized betas, the effects of rural/urban experience were consistently much less than the effects of current residence. The effects of the nonecological variable of homemaker's age were statistically significant and consistently much greater than effects of either of the rurality/urbanism variables, although the nature of the effect of homemaker's age was not consistent. Husband's absence also had a markedly greater effect than rurality/urbanism on whether or not a household was extended.

Table 2 shows the main effects of the independent variables on three indicators of interaction with kin: number of visits with kin per month, predominance of kin over nonkin visits, and receipt of nonmonetary aid from kin. Again, the effects of the rurality/urbanism variables were not great enough to be statistically significant, and again a consistent finding was that rural/urban experience had a much smaller effect than current residence. Unlike the nonecological variable effects on co-residence, their effects on kin interaction were small and not statistically significant. In addition, none of the nonecological variables had consistently greater or less effect than the ecological variables.

Similar results are shown in Table 3 with reference to independent variable effects on relative functionality of interaction with kin versus nonkin. Neither the ecological nor the nonecological variables had effects of sufficient magnitude to be statistically significant, and no consistent pettern was found when nonecological and ecological effects were compared.

In this table, in contrast to Tables 2 and 3, differences between the effects of current residence and rural/urban experience also were not consistently patterned.

Further assessment and comparisons of the effects of the rurality/urbanism variables and the nonecological variables can be made by referring to Table 4. The coefficients of determination, shown in the first seven rows, "indicate the percent reduction in unexplained variation in each dependent variable accounted for by the main effects of each of the independent variables" (Kasarda and Janowitz, 1974:336). As one could have predicted from the analysis of Tables 1 - 3, the main effects of each of the rurality/urbanism variables generally had negligible explanatory value. With the exception of main effects of homemaker's age on co-residence, the main effects of the nonecological variables also accounted for very little unexplained variation in extended familism.

The coefficients of multiple determination, in the last three rows of Table 4, indicate the reduction in unexplained variation in each extended familism variable accounted for by each of the rurality/urbanism variables and by both rurality/urbanism variables taken together after effects of all other independent variables were taken into account. Again, the explanatory value of the rurality/urbanism variables is shown to be virtually negligible.

## CONCLUSIONS

The findings shown in Tables 1 - 3 do not permit rejection of the null hypotheses that there are no rural-urban differences in extended familism among lower-and working-class Southern blackswhen nonecological variables are held constant. Of course, one must be cautious in concluding that no rural-urban differences exist, because Goodman's tests, like all tests of

significance, are sensitive to sample size and because the sampling procedures for this study were not simple random. However, the coefficients of determination shown in Table 4 were so slight with reference to the rurality/urbanism variables, they suggest that if rural-urban differences do exist, they are small.

Another noteworthy finding is that both the nonecological and ecological variable effects were insufficient to explain as much as one-half or more of the variation in extended familism among the blacks. This indicates that the study did not tap all of the important ecological and/or nonecological factors affecting extended familism among Southern lower- and working-class blacks. Possible ecological factors not considered are husband's rural/urban experience and the interaction effect between husband's and wife's rural-urban experience. Winch and Greer (1968) found the latter to be predictive in a white sample. Nonetheless, for these factors to be important for these blacks, this effect would have to be much greater than the virtually negligible effect of wife's experience--a possibility that seems remote.

A seemingly more likely possibility is that our models lack some pertinent nonecological factors which affect extended familism among lower- and working-class blacks. For the most part, the variables used in this study were selected because they had been observed to affect variation in extended familism of whites. Increasing evidence suggests that models which explain social behavior of whites are not appropriate for blacks (Cosby and Picou, 1975). The findings of this study signify the need for development of family theory which is inclusive of blacks and other minority groups and of theory which specifies causal models peculiar to such groups.

Table 1. Goodman's Effect Parameters (β) and Standardized Effects (β*) of Current Residence, Rural/Urban Experience, and Nonecological Variables on Patterns of Co-Residence of Kin.

| Independent Variables | Co-Residence Variables | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Extended Households | | Number of Generations | | Child-Keeping | |
| | β | β* | β | β* | β | β* |
| | Main Effects | | | | | |
| Residence | .085 | .96 | .028 | .31 | -.068 | -.73 |
| R/U Exper | .034 | .50 | .012 | .17 | .009 | .12 |
| Husband's Absence | .157 | 2.28[S] | .110 | 1.50 | -.043 | -.58 |
| Social Class | .010 | .14 | .062 | .85 | .113 | 1.53 |
| Migratory Status | .038 | .56 | .041 | .57 | -.034 | -.46 |
| Homemaker's Age | .343 | 4.02[S] | Q-.105 | Q-2.03[S] | .233 | 2.53[S] |

[S] indicates statistical significance at the .05 probability level.

Note: Where the independent variables were polytomous, the listed effect is linear unless a Q appears beside it. Q indicates the quadratic effect, which is listed if it was of greater magnitude than the linear effect.

Table 2. Goodman's Effect Parameters ($\beta$) and Standardized Effects ($\beta^*$) of Current Residence, Rural/Urban Experience, and Nonecological Variables on Interaction with Kin.

| Independent Variables | Kin Interaction Variables ($\chi_1$) | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number Visits per Month | | More Kin Than Nonkin Visits | | Kin Aid | |
| | $\beta$ | $\beta^*$ | $\beta$ | $\beta^*$ | $\beta$ | $\beta^*$ |
| | ---Main Effects--- | | | | | |
| Residence ($\chi_2$) | .111 | 1.31 | Q.065 | Q1.48 | .134 | 1.63 |
| R/U Exper. ($\chi_3$) | -.066 | -1.00 | -.003 | -.05 | .000 | .00 |
| Husband's Absence ($\chi_4$) | -.044 | -.66 | -.007 | -.10 | -.018 | -.28 |
| Social Class ($\chi_5$) | -.061 | -.91 | -.050 | -.77 | -.087 | -1.36 |
| Migratory Status ($\chi_6$) | -.001 | -.01 | -.011 | -.17 | .051 | .80 |
| Homemaker's Age ($\chi_7$) | -.200 | -2.42$^s$ | Q-.037 | Q-.83 | -.122 | -1.52 |

$^s$indicates statistical significance at the .05 probability level.

Note: Where the independent variables were polytomous, the listed effect is linear unless a Q appears beside it. Q indicates the quadratic effect, which is listed if it was of greater magnitude than the linear effect.

Table 3. Goodman's Effect Parameters ($\beta$) and Standardized Effects ($\beta^*$) of Current Residence, Rural/Urban Experience, and Nonecological Variables on Relative Functionality of Interaction with Kin to Nonkin

| Independent Variables | Relative Functionality ($\chi_1$) | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | GIVE more to Kin | | GET more from Kin | | TALK more to Kin | | Spend more TIME with kin | |
| | $\beta$ | $\beta^*$ | $\beta$ | $\beta^*$ | $\beta$ | $\beta^*$ | $\beta$ | $\beta^*$ |
| | ----------Main Effects---------- | | | | | | | |
| Residence ($\chi_2$) | .044 | .51 | .097 | 1.15 | Q.007 | Q-.15 | .100 | 1.21 |
| R/U Exper. ($\chi_3$) | .094 | 1.41 | .056 | .84 | .047 | .73 | .049 | .74 |
| Husband's Absence ($\chi_4$) | -.031 | -.47 | -.114 | -1.72 | -.050 | -.77 | -.024 | -.36 |
| Social Class ($\chi_5$) | -.006 | -.09 | -.075 | -1.14 | -.056 | -.86 | -.020 | -.31 |
| Migratory Status ($\chi_6$) | .117 | 1.75 | .055 | .84 | .062 | .95 | .106 | 1.61 |
| Homemaker's Age ($\chi_7$) | -.090 | -1.08 | -.092 | -1.12 | Q.015 | Q.33 | -.062 | -.76 |

$^S$ indicates statistical significance at the .05 probability level.

Note: Where the independent variables were polytomous, the listed effect is linear unless a Q appears beside it. Q indicates the quadratic effect, which is listed if it was of greater magnitude than the linear effect.

Table 4. Goodman's Coefficients* of Determination, Multiple Determination and Partial Determination between Measures of Extended Familism ($x_1$) and the Independent Variables of Current Residence ($x_2$), Rural/Urban Experience ($x_3$) and Nonecological Factors ($x_4$, $x_5$, $x_6$, $x_7$).**

| Coefficients | Dependent Variables ($x_1$) | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Co-Residence | | | Interaction with Kin | | | Relative Functionality | | | |
| | Extended Households | Number of Generations | Child-Keeping | No. Visits per Mo. | More Kin Visits | Kin Aid | Give More to Kin | Get More from Kin | Talk More to Kin | Spend more Time with Kin |
| $r^2_{12}$ | .03 | .00 | .04 | .03 | .07 | .15 | .11 | .10 | .05 | .19 |
| $r^2_{13}$ | .01 | .00 | .00 | .01 | .00 | .01 | .07 | .04 | .03 | .04 |
| $r^2_{14}$ | .09 | .08 | .00 | .03 | .00 | .04 | .04 | .15 | .06 | .04 |
| $r^2_{15}$ | .01 | .03 | .07 | .05 | .02 | .12 | .02 | .11 | .06 | .04 |
| $r^2_{16}$ | .00 | .01 | .02 | .00 | .00 | .10 | .16 | .07 | .07 | .18 |
| $r^2_{17}$ | .41 | .14 | .22 | .16 | .03 | .08 | .04 | .04 | .01 | .02 |
| $R^2_{1.4567}$ | .50 | .24 | .30 | .21 | .05 | .24 | .20 | .25 | .14 | .22 |
| $R^2_{1.234567}$ | .53 | .24 | .31 | .27 | .11 | .30 | .28 | .31 | .16 | .30 |
| $r^2_{12.34567}$ | .03 | .01 | .04 | .09 | .07 | .10 | .03 | .04 | .00 | .09 |
| $r^2_{13.24567}$ | .04 | .01 | .00 | .07 | .00 | .00 | .12 | .01 | .03 | .02 |
| $r^2_{123.4567}$ | .07 | .01 | .03 | .12 | .01 | .01 | .07 | .05 | .02 | .04 |

*These coefficients were calculated using Likelihood-Ratio Chi Squares.

**$x_4$ is husband's absence, $x_5$ is social class, $x_6$ is migratory status, $x_7$ is homemaker's age.

## REFERENCES


Adams, Bert N.
1968 Kinship in an Urban Setting. Chicago: Markham Publishing.

Aldous, Joan
1967 "Intergenerational visiting patterns: variation in boundary maintenance as an explanation." Family Process 6 (September ):235-251.

Bell, Wendell and Marion D. Boat
1962 "Urban neighborhoods and informal social relations." The American Journal of Sociology 62 (January):391-398.

Berardo, Felix M.
1966 "Kinship interaction and migrant adaptation in an aero-space-related community." Journal of Marriage and the Family 28 (August):296-304.

Bernard, Jessie
1966 Marriage and Family among Negroes. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Billingsley, Andrew
1968 Black Families in White America. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Blumberg, Leonard, and Robert R. Bell
1959 "Urban Migration and Kinship Ties." Social Problems 6 (Spring): 328-341.

Bonjean, Charles M.
1967 Sociological Measurement: An Inventory of Scales and Indices. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing.

Bultena, Gordon L.
1969 "Rural-urban differences in the familial interaction of the aged." Rural Sociology 34 (March):5-16.

Cohen, Albert K., and Harold M. Hodges Jr.
1963 "Characteristics of the lower-blue-collar class." Social Problems 10 (Spring):303-334.

Cosby, Arthur G., and J. Steven Picou
1975 "Model of the transmission of educational status: sex-race differentials." Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Southern Association of Agricultural Scientists, New Orleans.

Davis, James A.
1974 "Hierarchical models for signigicance tests in multivariate contingency tables: An exegesis of Goodman's recent papers." Pp. 189-231 in Herbert L. Costner (ed.), Sociological Methodology. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Drake, St. Clair, and Cayton, Horace R.
1962 Black Metropolis. (Revised edition.) New York: Harper and Row.

Feagin, Joe
1968 "The Kinship ties of Negro urbanities." Social Science Quarterly 49 (December):660-665.

Fischer, Claude S.
1975 "Toward a subcultural theory of urbanism." American Journal of Sociology 80 (May):1319-1341.

Frazier, E. Franklin
1939 The Negro Family in the United States. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gans, Herbert J.
1962 The Urban Villagers. New York: The Free Press.

Goodman, Leo A.
1972 "A modified multiple regression approach to the analysis of dichotomous variables." American Sociological Review 37 (February): 28-46.

1970 "The multivariate analysis of qualitative data: interactions among multiple classifications." Journal of the American Statistical Association 65 ( ):226-256.

n.d. "ECTA Program: Description for Users." Mimeographed.

Hines, Fred K., David L. Brown, and John M. Zimmer
1975 Social and Economic Characteristics of the Population in Metro and Nonmetro Counties, 1970. Agricultural Economic Report No. 272. Washington: Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Kahl, Joseph A.
1968 The Measurement of Moderism. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Kasarda, John D. and Morris Janowitz
1974 "Community attachment in mass society." American Sociological Review 39 (June):328-339.

Keil, Charles
1966 Urban Blues. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Key, William H.
1961 "Rural-urban differences and the family." Sociological Quarterly 2 (January):49-56.

Litwak, Eugene
1960 "Geographic mobility, and extended family cohension." American Sociological Review 25 (June):385-394.

Mercer, Charles V.
1967 "Interrelations among family stability, family composition, residence, and race." Journal of Marriage and the Family 29 (August):456-460.

Palisi, Bartolomeo J.
1966 "Ethnic generation and family structure." Journal of Marriage and the Family 28 (February):49-50.

Reiss, P.J.
1962 "The extended family system: correlates of and attitudes on frequency of interaction." Marriage and Family Living 24 (August):333-339.

Stack, Carol B.
1974 All Our Kin: Strategies for Survival in a Black Community. New York: Harper and Row.

Straus, Murray A.
1969 "Social class and farm-city differences in interaction with kin in relation to societal modernization." Rural Sociology 34 (December): 476-495.

Sussman, Marvin B., and Lee Burchinal
1962 "Kin family network: unhearalded structure in current conceptualizations of family functioning." Marriage and Family Living 24 (August):231-240.

Sweetser, Dorrian Apple
1966 "The effect of industrialization on intergenerational solidarity." Rural Sociology 31 (June):156-170.

Winch, Robert F., and Rae Lesser Blumberg
1968 "Societal complexity and familial organization." Pp. 70-92 in Robert F. Winch and Louise Wolf Goodman (eds.), Selected Studies in Marriage and the Family. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Winch, Robert F., and Scott A. Greer
1968 "Urbanism, ethnicity and extended families." Journal of Marriage and Family 30 (February):40-45.

FOOTNOTES

1. In this paper, the term "extended familism" is used to refer to the gamut of behaviors and attitudes of individuals toward their extended kin.
2. In this paper, "rural-urban differences" refers to any variation along the rural-urban continuum, such as between small-urban and large metropolitan centers or between metropolitan and nonmetropolitan centers.
3. Neglect of these interests has been a general trend to which there are some notable exceptions, such as Winch and Greer (1968).
4. Claude Fischer (1975) presents an intriguing alternative to current ecological and nonecological theories of rural-urban differences in general: a subcultural theory of urbanism. His thesis is that "population concentration (urbanism) produces a diversity of subcultures, strengthens them, and fosters diffusion among them" (Fischer, 1975:1319). The result is greater unconventionality in urban than rural areas. Although he acknowledges that the more important influences on behavior are nonecological, he argues that ecological factors (i.e., "population density, heterogeneity, and especially size" (Fischer, 1975: 1337)) are necessary for a full understanding of rural-urban differences.
5. Differences in social and economic statistics of the study areas shown in reports of the 1970 U.S. census can be compared with differences between similar statistics for the "greater metropolitan core" and "less urbanized nonmetropolitan areas not adjacent to an SMSA" of the U.S. generally shown in Hines, et al., 1975.
6. "Communities" in this context connotes open-country, rural areas rather than villages.
7. A constant of one-half was added to all cells of the contingency tables. This procedure is advocated by Goodman (n.d.) when cell frequencies are

small. This adjustment"...reduces both the asymptotic bias and mean-squared-error of Tau" (Goodman, 1970:229). (Note: Tau is the antilog of Goodman's Beta value).

8. Statistical significance was determined as in Kasarda and Janowitz, 1974. "With large samples, the Betas are normally distributed with a mean zero and a unit variance. Therefore, to determine statistical significance, one consults a table of areas under a normal curve. For example, a Beta* ($\beta^*$ abbreviated) of greater absolute value than 1.96 is statistically significant at the .05 probability level. Likewise, a $\beta^*$ of greater absolute value than 2.58 is statistically significant at the .01 probability level." (Kasarda and Janowitz, 1974:333).
9. Standardized Betas ($\beta^*$) were computed by dividing each Beta by its standard deviation (Goodman, 1970; 1972).